



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,491	10/16/2003	Atsuki Kasashima	Q77963	5369

7590 03/25/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER
----------

HUNTER, ALVIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b></p> <p>10/685,491</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b></p> <p>KASASHIMA ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b></p> <p>Alvin A. Hunter</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b></p> <p>3711</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/16/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because abstract is not between 50 to 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan (USPN 6139448).

Sullivan shows a golf ball having annular raised ridges (See Figures 3 and 5). In regards to claim 6, Sullivan shows the ridges having an arcuate contoured top (See Figures 3 and 5).

Claims 1, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimosaka et al. (USPN 5916044).

Shimosaka et al. shows a golf ball having annular raised ridges (See Figure 7).

In regards to claim 6, Shimosaka et al. shows the ridges having an arcuate countoured top (See Figure 7).

In regards to claim 8, Shimosaka et al. shows the ridges having a height of 0.23mm from the spherical surface (See Figure 7).

Art Unit: 3711

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogg (USPN 6290615).

Ogg shows a golf ball having projections (40), or annular raised ridges (See Figure 4A, 5, 6).

In regards to claim 2, Figure 4 shows the ridges intersecting each other

In regards to claim 3, Figure 4 shows the ridges of equal sizes intersecting each other.

In regards to claim 4, Figure 1 shows ridges of different sizes intersecting each other.

In regards to claim 6, Figures 4A, 5, and 6 show ridges having an apex (50), or arcuate contoured top.

In regards to claim 7, the radius of a convex section (56), or radius of curvature, is 0.0275 in. to 0.0350 in., or 0.7 to 0.9mm (See Figure 8 and Column 6, lines 23 through 34).

In regards to claim 8, the height of the ridges 0.007 in, or 0.18 mm (See Column 6, lines 1 through 22).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3711

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (USPN 61394480) in view of Aoyama (USPN 4560168).

Sullivan does not disclose the arrangement being isocahedron. Aoyama disclose a golf ball having an isocahedral arrangement wherein the arrangement provides optimal aerodynamic performance (See Summary of the Invention). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate an isocahedral arrangement, as taught by Aoyama, into that of Sullivan, in order to optimize the flight performance of the golf ball.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimosaka et al. (USPN 5916044) in view of Aoyama (USPN 4560168).

Shimosaka et al. does not disclose the arrangement being isocahedron. Aoyama disclose a golf ball having an isocahedral arrangement wherein the arrangement provides optimal aerodynamic performance (See Summary of the Invention). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate an isocahedral arrangement, as taught by Aoyama, into that of Shimosaka et al., in order to optimize the flight performance of the golf ball.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 703-306-5693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Vidovich, can be reached on 703-308-1207. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAN

Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

  
Stephen P. Garcia  
Primary Examiner